

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Planning, Development & Transportation Committee** was held on Monday, July 25, 2016 in Room 161, UW Extension, 1150 Bellevue Street

Present: Supervisors Bernie Erickson, Dave Kaster, Dave Landwehr, Tom Sieber, Norbert Dantine
Also Present: Supervisors Schadewald, Lund, Moynihan, Clancy, Brusky, Ballard; Paul Fontecchio, Judy Knudsen, Nick Uitenbroek, Jeff Oudeans, Tom Miller, Dean Haen, Chad Weininger, news media and other interested parties.

****Audio of the meeting is available by contacting the County Board office (920) 448-4015.***

I. Call Meeting to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Supervisor Erickson at 6:22 p.m.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve with the modifications to take 20 after 35a and move Item 35a after Comments from the Public. Vote taken. Aye: Sieber, Landwehr, Erickson; Nay: Dantine, Kaster. MOTION CARRIED

Motion made by Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to accept the agenda as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of June 27, 2016.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. Review minutes of: (None)

Comments from the Public None.

Although shown in proper format here, Item 35a was taken at this time.

Communications

2. Communication from Supervisor Schadewald re: This communication is my request that the annual payment from Duke Energy for the Shirley Wind Project be placed in segregated fund in the 2017 budget under the Health Dept. for use in a study of health effects of wind turbines on residents of Brown County. *Referred from July County Board.*

Schadewald was informed last year that Duke Energy paid the county an annual payment by their agreement when they built the turbines. They informed it was already placed in the budget but now it's the next year and he is coming back before it's placed in their budget and ask to take out which causes hardship, he felt the prudent thing to do was take it out of the PD&T budget because Duke Energy was the wind turbine and the \$26,667 should be spent towards something related to wind turbines. He didn't want to surprise anyone when they got to the budget session. He felt it was prudent, the Board of Health has heard from a number of residents who would like that money used for health studies. He would like PD&T to recommend to the Executive that he move it ahead of time by building in the money they need beforehand.

Dantine questioned why the Health Department didn't allocate tax money rather than take the payments which were being paid to the Planning Department. Schadewald would agree in the sense that a lot of people never

understood why it went to Planning. He didn't want to cut the Planning Department, but not say that these dollars came from Duke Energy. Lamine stated that when Duke Energy purchased the wind turbines they had gathered a lot of information from their office using the GIS and mapping information available in their office. As part of the conditional use permit they entered into with the town, there was an existing system that you didn't have the taxes that would be rendered in lieu of taxes for utility type operations. If it was a larger project, 2/3 would go to the county, 1/3 to the town that it was located in. This was a smaller project and did not hit that threshold, the town negotiated and said 1/3 would go to the county, 2/3 would go to the town. Because of the information that they had received with the GIS information and mapping information provided was helpful and to continue to fund some of those efforts and help them to reduce some of their costs for their Land Information Office. It's been added to their budget about seven to eight years and their biggest concern was if you take the money out, he had to fill that hole someplace with funds from the levy or the Executive or make cuts. Schadewald's intent was to replace funds from the tax levy versus Duke Energy. They all end up in the same; it was just where the money went. Lund stated that if they put the \$26,000 on the levy instead of Duke Energy and put it over to the Health Department, they would have to tax \$26,000 more. It was not a cost shift; they would have to raise the taxes or find the \$26,000 some other way. Unless they lowered the Planning's budget and raised the Health Departments'. Schadewald felt the understanding in budget was they were already doing that. Lund felt nobody had that number yet. Schadewald stated that's why he was saying, do it now before to they got to the point.

Landwehr supported the underlying idea, his concern was that they were just looking at the dollar amount was what they were getting from Duke. He questioned why they weren't looking at what they were looking to study and how much it was going to cost to study that and then talk to the Executive and work it through the County Board to fund what they needed to get the answers they needed to do what they did and leave that money alone. They were then not taking Duke's money to possibly work it against Duke. Schadewald felt it made sense if they were in a vacuum of just this committee and this department but the County Board was also telling the Health Department to start going over the complaints of Duke Energy but weren't getting any more money. In the big picture these were different things. The study part specifically, most people believed this was going to be a fairly big study and they needed someone who could help them. He suggested putting it in a segregated fund as they may not spend it next year, they may spend it on was how big of a study; there were some different allocations that it could be used for. Landwehr would be very supportive of the basic idea and of doing it for one year and then look at it again. He didn't want to make it permanent extra money to the Health Department indefinitely.

Lund stated wind turbines were all over the state and they weren't in a vacuum in Brown County. He didn't think \$27,000 was going to pay for much of a study as they can run millions of dollars. How could the county pay millions when there are turbines all over the state. He felt it was more of a state and national problem than a local problem and they needed to look for more global solution than just Brown County to shut down the Shirley wind turbines. They had to study all turbines and look at health concerns in communities in the entire country. If someone else wanted to put turbines in the county and they weren't already here, he would not be for putting turbines in without the results of the studies. The state gave the permit now because no one wanted them in their area.

Responding to Erickson, Schadewald informed that there were 80 documented cases of people complaining in the five year study that the Board of Health did. Everything Lund said the people understood, the State of Wisconsin had \$250,000 in their budget and then the governor said the legislature took it out, but who knows. Globally he was not sure but in the United States, the Board of Health was contacting the CDC, congress, congressional representatives, senators, etc. Erickson believed there were studies done locally regarding infrasound, Schadewald was speaking about a medical study and that's why he said health effects. The understanding was that Duke Energy was paying money to Brown County and the people living here affected by it would like to see that money go towards a health study. The Health Director made a decision based on the lack of medical studies. Everyone including the State of Wisconsin, more medical studies were needed. Erickson agreed with Lund and Dantine, that was nowhere near enough money. A discussion ensued as to where the money should come from and who they should recommend sending this to. Sieber stated to take this money and put it aside, the arena study was already set and they got \$25,000 to be included in the study. This was asking them to take a \$27,000 hole in their PD&T budget and put it aside, he was not in favor of that at all. In talking with the wind turbine people that have issues, they keep saying no more studies were needed, they had states and countries do studies and he had no idea what they could possibly study that hasn't been studied already. He didn't think it was Brown County's responsibility to find the solution to the

health problems of people next to wind turbines. It was a much bigger issue than Brown County and if someone came forward they could have that discussion. He would like to find out what is going to be different from that study from any other studies. He thanked Schadewald for coming and understood why the correlation was being made but wouldn't vote to fund the study directed or led by Brown County or in favor of spending or putting money aside.

Supervisor Brusky stated that although this was an issue on the worldwide stage, if they could make an impact on the local level, it would be instrumental in changing things worldwide and someone had to start somewhere. There were studies in Portugal and all over the world and they needed to do what they could in Brown County for their citizens. It might not be a study; it may be funds to put aside for something to impact this. Individually supervisors were working on things and they didn't know what direction to necessarily go. She felt they could make an impact in Brown County and supported this.

Kaster questioned why they couldn't use a study that had already been done without doing another one? Schadewald informed that these turbines were some of the biggest ones and they were also located 1,250' from people which is different than other places. He understood why the Duke Energy money went in there originally but he didn't understand it right now.

Sieber informed they didn't have any authority to tell Duke to shut off the turbines and they could end up having money just sitting for a study. If they can't get them to turn it off, they won't have a study. There was no reason this money had to come out of PD&T. If this was important enough the board could budget for it and not take Duke Energy's money. Schadewald stated their committees heard from the people and agreed, why should the money go to Planning and Development and he couldn't answer them. Sieber felt the other committees could make a recommendation on how to fund it and didn't think it should come out of that money.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Communication from Supervisor Erickson re: Look into the possible purchase of the property located on the Fox River at Broadway and West Mason Street to be used as port expansion that adds to the economy of Greater Green Bay and Brown County. Held for 90 days.**

Port & Resource Recovery Director Dean Haen stated they talked about doing the Port acquisition strategy that the Harbor Commission was working on; he did not know where the city was with the Bullfrog stadium.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Jim Schmidt – City of Green Bay Mayor

Schmidt stated there was no communication, Haen didn't know anything about it, and they didn't know anything about it. Erickson interjected that they were just wondering if it became available. Schmidt didn't understand why this had to be in the press and the paper and why like everyone else they couldn't call their office to talk about it. They were willing to talk but the communication with the county was not good. They were more than happy to talk with them, they had applied for grants to reinforce the wall around this piece of property, and they want a tax base. It was an active site for them. If they were interested, they would ask the county to follow the process like they were doing for the last 150 years instead of the front page of the paper. He didn't understand the communication. They were happy to talk to the county about anything, although he wanted to say that they had a proposal in September that looked and felt good. They preferred not to work through the press and preferred to work with the talented people the county had on staff.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Communication from Supervisor Sieber re: To conduct a drainage study along County Highway A and I. *Referred from July County Board.***

Sieber informed he had a number of calls regarding CTH A, talking about drainage; they had a lot of development in that area. He walked to Public Work Director Fontecchio and he said a consultant could do a drain study for them for around \$25,000. He was asking to bring this forward so it be included in the budget during the budget process, that the study be conducted to see what they were dealing with and how big of a problem they had and how much it would cost to fix. There were a number of areas on Nicolet Drive where it was built up higher than the water runs off into the bay. They had always had ditching there that would be able to collect the water and with the amount of urbanization in the Red Smith area and off Nicolet Drive, a lot of that water where it used to go into the ditch, the ditch had filled in over the number of years that the water was coming in and just going over the road and right down into people's homes that were living out there. They were concerned that after they fix one, they make a hole in another one. The study would give a better handle at what they were dealing with and how much it would cost to fix.

Fontecchio added that they had ledge rock there and people with homes that their basements went into that ledge rock which was compounding the problem. Some of those ditches along A were pretty shallow. They couldn't go deeper with the ditches or they would be in the ledge rock. It was a little bit of a unique situation. They will want to coordinate their efforts with the City of Green Bay. All they had was their county highways, which was a long skinny corridor and the drainage study was a bigger geographical area. It was more than they could handle in house because it was unique; their staff was staffed to handle their projects on a yearly basis. Before they spend \$25,000 on a study, Dantine questioned if the City of Green Bay's Engineers could do a study on it? Fontecchio would guess that they don't have the background as this was pretty specialized but they can incorporate that in their discussions. Dantine would hate to spend more money on a study as they were constantly studying things. Erickson informed that this had come before this committee before and there were people there, a lot of them that had a tendency of dumping their grass and leaves in those ditches and it wasn't a natural fill-in. They were being clogged and congested. Landwehr stated that to some extent it may be the case but that's where the Highway Department did trash pickup and inspection and he would assume that someone was reporting it and sending letters to clean up or get billed. He felt it probably went deeper than that.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to send this to staff and bring back in 60 days. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UW-Extension

5. **Budget Status Financial Report for May 2016.**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **Budget Adjustment Request (16-56): Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue.**

UW-Extension in conjunction with Jackson County, had received a Farm Safety Grant to produce education resources for Agricultural Chemical Safety in Spanish in the form of videotapes and curriculum materials. Budget impact - \$1,500.

Motion made by Supervisor Kaster, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **Director's Report.**

Knudsen reported on the following:

- They were getting ready for the Brown County Fair, August 17-21, 2016.

- They received \$25,000 in Outlay for 2016 to be used for the construction of a greenhouse out back to use for programming efforts and training individuals with cognitive or physical disabilities, high functioning, to work in the greenhouse industry as there was a huge shortage of employees that will work in greenhouses.
- They had been piloting and doing camps for kids this summer: They just started their 2nd robotics camp at UWGB for middle school kids on building and programming their Lego robots; both camps were filled. They did a foodie camp for kids a week ago and they had so many kids sign up they were doing another one this week and they had a local chef in town who was teaching 3 days of that camp. Next week they were doing with the Parks Department an adventure camp for middle school kids; they will be going caving, kayaking, etc.
- With regard to their community gardens, they will be expanding their gardens to 11 next year, they had 10 this year. They will be opening a garden for veterans and had been working with Veterans Manor on that.
- UW-Extension was in the midst of a reorganization that was going very slowly.
- There were 4,500 people in attendance for Breakfast on the Farm which was a small crowd but it was a cold day and the farm wasn't real large.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Register of Deeds

8. Budget Status Financial Report for June 2016.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Departmental Openings Summary.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Port & Resource Recovery

10. 2017 Capital Improvements Program – Non Bonding Requests.

The City of Green Bay was aware of the possibility of a Bay Port Expansion; they gave them 10 years of free use which expires in February. Haen sent them a land lease if they wanted to stay there and used what they were leasing other lands for, about \$500 an acre per month, there were 36 acres. They had a choice whether they wanted to negotiate that rate or vacate the property and looking for a three year lease. He didn't know what their intent would be.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. Cat Island Legal Opinion Regarding Corps Final Accounting.

Haen briefly spoke to the letter in the agenda packet material.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. Port Budget Status Financial Performance Report 2nd Qtr.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. **Resource Recovery Budget Status Financial Performance Report 2nd Qtr.**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

14. **Director's Report.**

Haen informed they were underway doing an analysis on their leachate for the future south landfill. They had to go to a wastewater treatment plant or they could treat it onsite. They looked at Heart of the Valley, Kaukauna, Wrightstown and NEW Water and determined based on the rates that it would be to their advantage to go to NEW Water. They also looked at their transportation for piping it, running a pipeline, or trucking it. It was determined that trucking it was the cheapest option rather than having their own dedicated pipe with lift stations, etc. The study was not complete but that was the way it was heading. They has a leachate unloading station in De Pere, it went to the De Pere plan and was not connected to the one at the mouth of the river. If they re-plumb that to NEW Water interceptor they can use that offloading station and not run trucks from De Pere to the mouth of the Bay. It would be great savings if they can figure that out in terms of reducing the transportation costs.

Tall Ships will be here in a couple weeks. The Port was sponsoring a ship; they will be down there working the festival. They had promotional items in which he shared with the committee. It was a showcase of the Port.

The Property Acquisition Plan was being formulated and they may be done in August or September.

With regard to Fox River Fiber Outagamie County, they were down to two week increments of asking for additional time, it was months, and counties responded to Outagamie County. Outagamie County had been told by Michael Best & Friedrich LLP that if they don't respond they had some type of resolution that the county would be impeding Outagamie County in any lawsuit with Fox River Fiber.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Airport

15. **2017 Capital Improvements Program – Non Bonding Requests.**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. **RFP for ARFF and Armed Security Services.**

Sieber questioned if they had looked at separating the services out, Miller informed that was what they had now, the company they had provided both of those services and they would like to keep it together primarily for the cost savings. If they would break them apart, the cost would be significantly more. They were working on this for four months and there were three companies that could provide it, one would have to sub out a portion of the service. Landwehr questioning if there was a way to do them both, put it where it was an option. He felt limiting it could result in few bidders. If it's to the best interest of the county, he agreed with Sieber. It was something for consideration. Miller informed one thing they found was they had three shifts of four and the employees that worked on each shift were cross-trained to do both services. A lot of it was similar to the way Ashwaubenon ran their Public Safety Department. The Airport did the same with their employees; they were all cross-trained. They utilized mutual aid services if an event became too large. The way they had it laid out right now, they believed it was more cost effective to have the service combined. They believed because of the cross training and cross utilization of employees over the 24-hour shift that they get a lot better bang for the buck. Landwehr felt anytime they could make it where the potential was there to get more bidders, it would help save the county and the airport a lot of money. By doing that and if that was the case where people were cross trained then obviously their bids would come back and reflect that. It was a check and balance type thing.

Dantinne understood what they were saying and the cost savings but felt it was a lot simpler if one company was taking care of it.

Miller informed they were allowed to extend the existing contract for two years and they took a cut in the last year of their original contract in order for the extension to take place. If they did choose to break it apart, he would respectfully request that the existing contract be extended for 90 days as they will have to go back and rewrite this and come back and repost.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to split the RFP into two separate RFPs with the option of being combined and extend the current contract for 90 days. Vote taken. Aye: Sieber, Landwehr, Kaster; Nay: Dantinne, Erickson. MOTION CARRIED 3 to 2

split the two into two separate RFPs with the option of being combined

17. **Budget Status Financial Report for June 2016.**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file budget status financial report. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

18. **Departmental Opening Summary. No openings, no action needed.**

19. **Director's Report.**

EAA started today and for the first time in 5 years they had a rather significant increase of planes parked at GRB compared to a year ago. They had 71 as of 8am this morning and expected the numbers will grow as the week progressed.

The International Rivals terminal for customs opened last month. They had a record June. They cleared 39 airplanes in their new facility and they believed a lot of it had to do with the new facility and there was no cost to clear customs at Green Bay. They attracted a lot of new customers.

TSA Pre-Check Program was in affect the week of July 11th. There were more than 550 individuals signed up and can use for the next five years. It went very well, very smoothly operated and didn't have a lot of people waiting for extended periods of time in order to go through.

Badgers LSU game was coming up Labor Day weekend, huge impact on the airport, there will be at least 7 charters coming in with LSU fans. Badger fans will fly in on regularly scheduled commercial service or will drive. It's expected to be a rather sizeable impact on the community. The closest hotel, as he understood that was available right now was Sheboygan. Tickets were pricey and should be a wild Labor Day weekend in Green Bay.

They continue to work with the Neville on developing a permanent display for Austin Straubel at the Airport and were hoping to have that done by the middle of October when Straubel was inducted into the Wisconsin Aviation Hall of Fame.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantinne, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 21 was taken after item 19

Referral from July County Board

20. **An Ordinance to Amend Sections 4.49 and 4.57 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances Entitled, Respectively, as "Extra Pay" and "Policy".**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to hold until the August meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Planning and Land Services

Land Information – No agenda items.

Planning Commission

21. **Update regarding development of the Brown County Farm property – standing item.**

No update at this point. No action needed.

22. **Departmental Opening Summary.**

Lamine spoke to the handout in the agenda packet material.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

23. **Capital Improvement Plan: 2017 Land Information/Tax Collection System.**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

24. **Request for Approval to publish RFP for Project 2087: Land Information/Tax Collection System.**

Lamine informed that this project had been in process for some time. They did an RFI a few years back to get some sense of cost which was the information used for the CIP. They did a LEAN project in 2013 looking at the existing system trying to make sure that they were covering every base, that the software and hardware needs would address the needs for getting that tax bill out. The element that was critically important to their department was the tax records in terms of the property listing function and linking all that information to a GIS based map.

Landwehr questioned how many different products were out there, different company offerings that would satisfy the specs? He wanted to make sure they were broad based specs. Lamine believed that right now, operating within the State of Wisconsin there were two primary vendors but there were probably vendors that were national as well and it would be put out on a broad basis. A member of the audience interjected that they had invited some vendors to do some demonstrations a couple months ago and they had a minimum of 10 companies contacting her, so they were out there.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

25. **Budget Status Financial Report for June 2016 (Unaudited). *See Item 27***

Property Listing

26. **Budget Status Financial Report for June 2016 (Unaudited). *See Item 27.***

Zoning

27. **Budget Status Financial Report for June 2016 (Unaudited).**

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file Items 25, 26 & 27. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Public Works

28. **Summary of Operations.**

Fontecchio referred to the material in the packet; no questions were posed.

Referring to the Staffing Summary, under the Highway Division, they had two Highway Crew crossed off and re-classed to Sign Crew, Sieber looked through the budget book and couldn't find Sign Crew. Fontecchio informed that it went to Executive Committee a month or two ago. They were still crew members but they had some inconsistencies and wanted to make two of their four year-round positions and make them permanent. He explained he couldn't have all four of his guys bid out on the sign crew; there was more expertise there that they needed to be permanently assigned to the Sign Crew. The two guys that accepted the Sign Crew position won't be allowed to go and take a bid section for a state snowplow, etc. They will be on the Sign Crew permanently. It was a little different job description, same pay, same general job duties but more of a focus on Sign Crew. Questions posed on whether there was a Table of Organization change, Sieber stated he would put in a communication to discuss next month.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file Summary of Operations. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

29. Director's Report.

Fontecchio briefly went through the written Director's Report which was located in the agenda packet material.

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

30. 2017 Executive Bonding Proposal and Capital Improvements Program – Non Bonding Requests.

Fontecchio provided an edit to the Public Works CIP (attached). He informed part of the Velp Avenue project, at Velp and Lineville they were going to make a third middle lane, a 2-way left turn lane, on Lineville going from the Shopko round-about to the Velp round-about. It was due to the increase in traffic. They will have a more detailed discussion tomorrow with the Village. It was estimated at \$100,000 more.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

31. Report & Discussion re: Housekeeper Turnover - Department Vacancies Report as of June 2016.

Last fall they had the Class and Comp, they got to Admin with the appeals and to the Airport and that's as far as they got. His analysis was all in there and if they went back to that, the paygrade right now was at 20 with a minimum dollar value of \$10.91 an hour. That's what they were starting their offers at. At a way of comparison, he heard Costco was hiring at \$13 an hour starting out so they could have problems hiring. Public Works had proposed at putting the housekeepers in a paygrade 17 which started them at \$13.57 an hour which may eliminate a lot of their problems. One of the reason they were seeing some of the openings in housekeeping was because they decided to internally to put it on hold for a little bit. They had Clean Power in the Northern Building and Sophie Beaumont Building because they were so short staffed with housekeeping. They had been going out for advertising, get someone and immediately lose them. It was a perpetual grind of that for various reasons. They had an RFP out right now and hoped to bring numbers in August to see in the noncritical areas, see what the price was to go outside. It may help them gauge their own pay range. He felt it was a time where it warrants at least looking at, because their hands were kind of tied with what they were paying people. Part of the problem he struggled with, going back to look at October when this was addressed, it wasn't just housekeepers that they had pay problems with.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to hold until the August meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

32. Resolution to Approval a Jurisdictional Transfer Agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Brown County for CTH Y as part of the STH 29/STH 156 Intersection Improvement Project.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

33. Bid recommendation and approval for Bid Project #2079 – Northern Building Boiler Replacement.

There was a savings from the Northern Building Hot Water Heater project. When they went out for bids for the Northern Building Boilers they had the opportunity to get two for almost the amount they budgeted for one. They would like to move the savings from the Hot Water Heaters to use toward this so that they can take advantage of the pricing and get two rather than just one that was budgeted. Two were needed.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Sieber to approve the bid to Mechanical Technologies in the amount of \$69,192 for Bid Project 2079 – Northern Building Boiler Replacement. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

34. Budget Adjustment Request (16-69): Any allocation from a department's fund balance.

In the Department's effort to convert the County Highway Bridge Aid account to be more in line with how the State had intended to be set up at notice was sent out with the 2017 Petitions for bridge aid that they could request their portion of the fund balance to be sent back to them so their account could be converted over to just being Brown County Funds as the Statute was intended. Since refunding these balances was not budgeted to be done these funds currently reside in the accounts Fund balance. This budget adjustment is to move the amount of the funds requested to be refunded to the current 2016 budget amount. A detailed list of the amounts requested by each municipality is attached as well as the current Bridge Aid Account Statement as of the end of June 2016. These funds are the Municipality's funds, not Brown County's Funds. Brown County was just holding these funds for future Bridge expenses. Budget Impact: \$1,139,764.50.

Motion made by Supervisor Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

35. An Ordinance creating Section 6.14 of the Brown County Code entitled, "County Trunk Highway Maintenance and Improvements."

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mike Walsh - De Pere Mayor & Eric Rakers – City Engineer

On behalf on of the City of De Pere, Walsh spoke against the Brown County changing the municipal agreement for road improvements and maintenance. He stated , the agreement, established by the County Board, had been in effect for decades and now the Brown County Public Works Department had proposed the county abandon that agreement based on vague and outdated state statutes and without input from municipalities. None was known until it was brought before this committee. Portions of 31 of 56 county highways were located in the urbanized area of Brown County. They not only serve all residents of the county but take them to malls, attractions, economic development areas that were essential to the growth of Brown County and other destination points, 90% of the equalized tax base was located in these urbanized areas, 92% of the property taxes for Brown County came from them also. The current agreement had a 50/50 cost share for improved cost, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which was promoted by the county through the Brown County's bicycle and pedestrian plan, and other highway and storm water improvements. With the highway department's plan, they only paid for 22' of pavement; the cost share should be based on actual costs that can be for the county's share, about 300-350 per lineal foot, instead of an artificially set \$68 per lineal foot. It was unfair to shift addition improvements costs to the residents that were currently shouldering 75% of those costs while providing improvements at no cost to rural residents. The result was not a net tax savings rather it just shifted to the urbanized Brown County residents. It had been said that the county doesn't want to have conflict with municipalities about the size and scope of the roads. They did have disagreements but they did get worked out but to lower funding because of this, just didn't make sense. It was said

that TIDs could pay for this; if that was the case it would put the economic wellbeing of Brown County at risk. By doing this it would lower the ability to offer incentives that may be necessary to get businesses to locate here thus they were not able to increase a tax base in Brown County or add jobs. The county received state aid for county highways, what happened to that aid if this was approved. Did they lose it or did it go somewhere else? These proposed changes were very important, not only to the municipalities but to the county as a whole. This was about how they moved forward into the future, how they wanted to be developed as a county and what kind of impact they will have as a regional hub. They all had a stake in the success of Brown County; they should all have some skin in the game for that success. He urged voting against abandoning the current Brown County municipal agreements.

Rakers followed up, the city was recommending that the current agreement, pre 2012 continue to be utilized. This agreement was in place for an extending period of time, since the agreement was signed by the city in 2011 for one of the county highway projects, there had been several modifications without any input from municipalities. The first incurred in 2013 which included a change to not participate in on street bike facilities, the second change was 2014 that required municipalities to agree to maintain items that were never addressed before including storm sewer, now they had a third revision that municipalities never had a chance to review until after the last meeting and he was not sure of the intent, he believed future revisions to these agreements needed to be reviewed with municipalities. Further discussions ensued with regard to bicycle and pedestrian facility agreements and revisions. He felt the Brown County Highway Department should be following and funding as recommended by the county plans, created by the Brown County Transportation Subcommittee made up of members of municipalities along with the Brown County Highway Department. He spoke to comments made at the June 27th meeting with regard to the differences for the county to accommodate. He explained there were two keys to analyzing bike and pedestrian facilities, how do the facilities fit the location, which was something required as part of the engineering and the connectivity of facilities between the municipalities. He questioned the interpretations made from a state statute in a memo presented to the board. He questioned why staff interpreted the state statute to mean a typical reconditioning project of only \$68 per foot, in the past, all past agreements were related to new and reconstruction of projects, these were significantly higher costs. Despite what the statute states, storm sewers were not included in the revision. Storm sewer systems were the drainage system for an urban roadway. They didn't believe the interpretations were correct.

Craig Berndt – Director of Public Works, Village of Allouez

Berndt provided a correspondence from the Village of Allouez (attached) and briefly went through the concerns and questions they had.

Steve Grenier – Director of Public Works, City of Green Bay

Grenier informed that the City of Green Bay agreed with the same sentiment put forth by De Pere and Allouez. They believed there were significant issues with the interpretations of state statute presented to the committee. They agreed with further investigation of cost allocations, more consistent with a grievance that dated back to the early mid-80's which they still had on file for projects conducted at that time. He informed the City of Green Bay was a willing participant on a financial perspective for county projects, even those where they had no financial responsibility to do so. Recently they entered into agreements on Oneida St. in front of the arena and they currently had a project going on Humboldt Rd., even though there was language that dated back to an agreement or jurisdictional transfer of those highways, the sole control and cost requirements of Brown County, dating back to 1979. For these reasons it behooved the county to continue pursuing negotiations and discussions with the municipalities if there was going to be a significant change to the ordinance.

Jim Schmidt – City of Green Bay Mayor

On behalf of the City of Green Bay, which was the largest municipality, Schmidt informed he echoed previous comments from De Pere, Allouez and the City of Green Bay's Public Works Director. Green Bay was in Brown County and they wanted to be a part of this. The communication had not been good. When this came up they scheduled their selves so they could be there. It was about having discussions before policies were slid in or not discussed with partners. They wanted to be a partner but it all started with discussion and communication with municipalities.

With regard to comments made about not being informed, Erickson stated that this committee held this so they could be informed. It was a situation where they found out about it, they sent it back and wanted all the communities to know about it.

Angela Gorall – Village Administrator, Village of Bellevue

Gorall thanked the committee for allowing them to come and view their thoughts on it. The Village of Bellevue would echo what was stated. Their Village Board did meet and discuss it and they supported having consistency and clear direction on what these agreements were going to be as there had been differences from project to project. They did feel that was important to get this clarified. They request more time to look at it and questioned some of the legal parameters and interpretations. She informed that some municipalities had gotten together once and were meeting again so they could consistently give them a good response rather than 10 responses from 10 municipalities. Lastly, part of the language was approval subject to the approval of the highway commissioner. They were a little concerned of if they designed, went through the engineering and laid out the project of how they would like to see it done, what were the parameters of getting that approval. They would want to know that very early and work with the Highway Department before they got too far down in a project and then not get that approval provided to them.

Geoff Farr – Director of Public Works, Village of Howard

Farr pointed out items with regard to complete streets, sidewalks, bike lanes, etc. He said it was something included in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan adopted by the County Board and they believed those items should be followed through with on county projects and it made sense for all of the communities. It created connectivity in planning for their local sidewalks, bike lanes, and how it transferred across, through and down county roadways. It was important to develop plans amongst the communities and Brown County. There had been discussion in the past about right-of-way acquisition, what was included and what was not included. Farr felt it was a very important topic because urban situations generally didn't have simply lanes in open ditches, he further expounded on their importance and noted right-of-ways were expensive and a point of contention. Whether those improvements or how those costs were split up, they needed to be worked out but right of way was part of the parcel to the whole equation and couldn't be ignored. They believed this represented a shift in costs to municipalities if the cost of the roadway that was being supported by the county weren't what they were. It wasn't fair to ask municipalities to shoulder a larger portion of the cost, by TIF or assessments because those were really funding mechanisms that were set aside for the urban municipalities for other purposes. This was about a county responsibility for roadway infrastructure and that needed to be supported appropriately. They would like to have the opportunity to work with Brown County staff and the board members to come up with something reasonable and agreeable by all parties.

Doug Martin – Director of Public Works, Village of Ashwaubenon

Martin informed that all the other communities knocked off his speaking points but was standing in support of all those committees and concerns because they had the same ones, it boiled down to the communication and working through these items. They had agreements that worked very well over the past decade. Understand there needed to be communication or discussions had as to reasons why there needed to be a change and not fully opposed to change but having to understand the reasoning behind it, working through them. There were a number of them sitting on the transportation subcommittees where the funding and review of multiple loads of transportation are reviewed and set into motion the terms of the plans. As that moved down the road, they needed to be able to work together between those different departments that had that input to make sure that those projects became a reality or if they aren't, specific reasons why that they can report back on.

Representative from Village of Suamico

A handout was circulated (attached) and spoken to. The Village of Suamico Board had gone on record in opposition to the policy set forth; they had a longstanding relationship with Brown County and their departments. They wanted to work in a positive manner with them. He asked that they take a good hard look at it; they were not against a policy that was fair, equitable and worked for all parties.

Mike Aubinger – Village President, Village of Ashwaubenon

Aubinger thanked the committee for opening this up so they knew about it. He explained it would have been better if they were approached when the reasoning was first thought of. They try to as governments do as much intergovernmental stuff as possible and part of that was catching this before it becomes people at a meeting complaining. The best thing to do was be it as a group and work it out and if they felt there was a problem with the assessment, come to them as a group, none of them were against change, they lived change every day. They wanted to be fair and equitable and wanted them to come to them and provide them a better model of intergovernmental

cooperation, which was all they were aiming for. He informed the Mayor of De Pere Mike Walsh said just about everything they needed.

Travis Coenen – Director of Public Works, Village of Wrightstown

They were also in agreement with the rest of the municipalities that they needed to have some work done for consistency to be fair and equitable with everyone else. They had good partnerships with Brown County and they would like to keep it that way. As all of the other communities in Brown County were working together on many different resources and avenues to cut costs and provide better services for the community, this was one of those things they would like to communicate and get together with Brown County, the board and the Highway Department to work on.

Scott Brosteau– Town Engineer, Village of Ledgeview

Brosteau echoed everything that had been said and wanted to show support with the villages and cities and with them being the only town so far they echoed the concern about working with the county on projects.

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Landwehr, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to send this back to staff to work with the area municipalities and develop a solution to this and bring it back in 60 days. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Dantinne felt most of the statements here were one size was not going to fit all of them as townships, municipalities, villages and cities so they needed to take that into consideration. They couldn't make a one size fits all and that's why he wanted two to three months to work with staff and get input and bring it back here.

Fontecchio thanked everyone for coming, he appreciated it. The intention was not to slide anything by a municipality but to have a good policy discussion and this started months ago when Supervisor Landwehr asked "what's your policy?" and they had been working on it and had been searching out and had a gentleman from von Briesen come and they've had good discussions so far. He felt this was great discussion, good to hear and obviously the municipalities took it serious, they looked at it and he felt that working with them in the next 60 days will be very positive and hopefully they will come to something that will work for everybody.

Supervisor Lund stated that with his experience in the past, when you put something out there that looked like a completed deal and you bring it to committee, which always seemed to put controversy, especially something that dealt with all the other municipalities. He had 14 years of experience doing this and experience at the local level also and he was glad that they were making the motion to put this off for 60 days or so and get everybody in agreement. It was probably not going to be a one-size-fits-all but they had to have all the scenarios involved in the roads and figure out what's an equitable cost share to all the municipalities in Brown County.

Supervisor Schadewald recommended in their 60 days to save time was he heard a couple different issues, one was engineering, one was legal and while the engineers and Fontecchio can get together to talk about certain things, when it came to the legal part, he would hope the municipalities and the cities attorney's, they should talk to the county's Corporation Counsel so they don't mix the two. They can't really have all the answers from one group just the way towns and villages were different. He recommended the legal interpretation go through the legal part of Brown County.

Kaster informed that the county was just about to start their budget so he didn't know how quick something like this will take effect. Fontecchio informed that where they were in their 6-year plan they didn't have too many cost-share agreements and focused a lot of resurfacing in the next few years. This was a good time to have this discussion because there shouldn't be anything really pressing.

Sieber stated there were a lot of comments about municipalities not knowing about this but stated he liked the way Director Fontecchio had brought this about, he brought forward to the committee a proposed changed first so they

weren't the last ones to know about it, they weren't reading about it in the paper. They as a committee decided what they wanted to do, which was get the municipalities input before they approved anything so Fontecchio sent the letters out to make sure everyone knew what they were doing. They were in a meeting with an attorney from Milwaukee to help talk about the role between the Highway Commissioner and the Highway Committee and the attorney was very clear that the cost sharing agreements were a County Board policy and they didn't have a policy on hand. They had nothing written. They had a legacy policy that had been around for a long time but they couldn't find anything approved by the board so they had to start somewhere. A lot of local controls had been taken away from the state so this was an opportunity to see if municipalities wanted more local control or if the cost sharing was more important than local control. He thought it was a good conversation to have and they had some direction now. It was good to have elected officials make the policy rather than have staff come up with everything behind closed doors, he felt it was good government. Sieber supported the motion and he was sure they would come out with something that looks really nice and something that was approved by the County Board and if it had to go back to their bodies, then it will go back to their bodies too.

Supervisor Clancy questioned if there were glaring qualities that brought this forward and question what prompted it. Fontecchio informed that they couldn't find anything approved by the County Board. They wanted to bring something to the County Board. As Sieber alluded to, there had been a lot of discussion over local control over some of these projects. Some of the things they struggled with, as Brown County's urban center expanded, it was expanding in a lot of different directions and they as the county get all of those requests. It was very difficult to weigh and balance how they fund it all when they only have a number of dollars a year. There were times where they moved projects around and could accommodate for other projects. But then there were times where things were coming forward and they needed to urbanize out further, how do they accommodate all of that? This proposal was a different way of looking at it. That maybe the municipalities wanted some more control over how they expand so it was a little bit different look at things. From his perspective, being a new Highway Commissioner, he'd rather have this discussion now and talk about it amongst them rather than have 50 discussions over the next 20 years. Clancy felt it just looked like a cost savings for the county because they were just going to expend so much money and he didn't think that was the intent. Fontecchio responded the intent was to start out a different way of looking at it based on the state statutes.

35a. An Ordinance creating Section 4.57(5) of the Brown County Code entitled "Overtime Compensation for Non-Exempt Employees of the Airport & Highway Department."

Fontecchio provided overtime scenarios for discussion purposes (attached). After looking at the overtime scenarios that they put together last month and the cost, Fontecchio as the Highway Commissioner supported this 4.57, he felt it was a good idea and paying the guys the overtime outside their scheduled workweek solved a number of problems they identified last month. He felt it solved billing problems and holiday and vacation problems they had with staffing. Part of this for him was the actual cost and realizing exactly how much this was going to cost the state, the county and he knew it was all taxpayer money but to see that breakdown, helped him to understand that for what this solved out at the Highway Department he felt it was money well spent. One of their guys at the last meeting made a point that we have different departments that run under different rules and they were like a different business especially in regards to their snowplow operations and emergency call in procedures especially at the airport and highway. He felt if they did 4.57 they wouldn't need to worry about the call-in time at time and a half, it took care of itself. Landwehr clarified that anything beyond eight hours worked would be time and a half even if they were not hitting 40 hours in the week. Fontecchio responded that from a billing perspective, it made more sense as they were charging time and a half for staff time.

Landwehr felt what they were billing for and this was two separate issues. He would like to see the laws associated with that. In a storm where they were plowing through the night and also cleaning up intersections and highway medians, they were going to end up paying a lot more time and a half. Fontecchio responded that where it came down to, it was an incremental difference. If a worker was working his normal 40 hour workweek, there was literally no difference for that person. The difference would be on holidays or if vacation time was used in that workweek, basically it counted towards it. Referring to the handouts, Sieber informed that the department was coming out \$350 ahead by making this change. The Airport estimated a \$1,689.50 in additional costs.

Schadewald questioned if this was call in or anything outside work hours? Erickson stated they wouldn't even go to

call in pay and this was just for Highway and Airport. Schadewald believed the Executive Committee was going to ask how they were different from other county employees. Fontecchio stated that Landwehr's scenario was correct, if an employee plowed through the night eight hours, they were getting time and a half because it was outside their normal day. They could potentially end up working theoretically 40 hours at time and a half for the week. Schadewald informed that there was a lot of resistance at the Executive Committee, 5 to 2 against because why would you treat them differently? It was a real factor to a lot of other County Board members. Why were they different than mental health, sanitarians that got called all the time at the Health Department, the understanding was there were a lot of employees (handout provided). He supported the idea but he didn't support it for singular units; that's where his resistance was, it was discriminatory. Sieber interjected, bring them forward. What they had control over was PD&T Committee which included Public Works and the Airport. They saw a need to include them and make a special rule for them. He would highly encourage Human Services to bring forward their CTC staff and their sanitarians and find out what sort of compensation they were getting. There was no way he would give up his holiday or Christmas to plow snow or to go out and find out if Sanimax smells on Christmas Eve. He felt they should be compensated for that because people outside of the public workforce don't do that. Most of these guys could go to any construction crew, get paid exactly the same they were doing and not have to put up with 24/7 coverage like they were doing here. If Human Services wanted to come forward and make the case for the sanitarians and CTC staff, if Public Safety wanted to come forward and make the case for the jail staffers, he was more than happy to listen to that. They were making the case for their departments that this needed to be done in order to keep them. It made sense; it was supported by the director and the committee members. HR wanted simple rules that everybody follows, he understood that but he felt there were a lot of differences and won't work for every department. There might be different policies that they need to have for different departments.

Schadewald wanted it understood that there were some costs; their whole budget was going to change. They heard at the Executive Committee that this was all covered; now the county funds will take a hit, capital projects, bonding, the levy will take a hit and other sources based on the language. Erickson felt those things will be billed to those communities in many cases. Schadewald felt they needed to let towns and villages know that when they do their budget that the county will bill them at a higher rate. It was part of the communication if they were going to do it. It was Schadewald's point to educate on what other county employees were feeling. He understood they were looking out for their guys but some were looking out for all county employees. He got confused if someone said they wanted to do it for the Highway Department but if other people ask for it, they may or may not vote for it; that bothered him.

Motion made by Sieber, seconded by Supervisor Dantine to accept this and to move this forward to Executive Committee as written. Vote taken. Nay: Landwehr. MOTION CARRIED 4 to 1

Item 2 was taken at this time.

Other

36. **Audit of bills.**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, seconded by Supervisor Landwehr to audit the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

37. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**

38. **Adjourn.**

Motion made by Supervisor Dantine, Seconded by Supervisor Kaster to adjourn at 9:34 p.m. Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Recording Secretary

2017 Capital Project 5-Year Outlook Summary
Planning, Development, & Transportation
 As of 7/12/16

Key for Funding Source:
 D = Debt Service G = Grants and Aids O = Operating Revenues M = Municipal Funds P = Project Tax Q = General Fund Balance R = TIF District S = Stadium District Sales Tax Refund

2017 EXECUTIVE BONDING PROPOSAL AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

DIVISION/ DEPARTMENT	FUNDING SOURCE	DEPT PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	TOTAL
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, & TRANSPORTATION:									
Planning and Land Services									
Public Works	D	1	Land Information & Tax Collection System Replacement	774,607					774,607
	D, TIF	2	Brown County Research & Business Park						*
Public Works	D	1	Courthouse Dome Replacement	1,790,000					1,790,000
	D	2	Courthouse Chiller Replacement		300,000				300,000
	D	3	Work Release Center Air Handling Unit Equipment Replacement		250,000				250,000
	D	4	Northern Building Exterior Window Replacement			400,000			400,000
	D	5	Law Enforcement Center Six Air Handling Unit Replacement					250,000	250,000
	D	2017-1	CTH D (Hickory Road to Barrington Drive) - Reconstruction	2,167,000					2,167,000
	D	2017-2	CTH D (Hickory Road to Hickory Drive) - Reconstruction	2,013,000					2,013,000
	D/G	2017-3	CTH HS (Glendale Ave to CTH B) - Surface Maintenance	2,332,000					2,332,000
	D/P	2017-5	CTH J (CTH M to Harbor Lights Rd) - Surface Maintenance	552,000					552,000
	D	2017-6	CTH Y (Shady Rd to Old 29) - Surface Maintenance	250,000					250,000
	D	2018-1	CTH ZZ (Tezlaiff Rd to STH 54) - Reconstruction	175,000	1,715,000				1,890,000
	D/G/P	2018-2	CTH ZZ (Bridge Over East River) - Bridge Replacement	10,000	1,396,000				1,406,000
		2017-9 /							
	O/P/M/G	2019-4	CTH EA (Willow Rd to STH 29) - Reconstruction	400,000		2,808,000			3,208,000
		2017-10							
	D/G/P	/ 2019-7	CTH ZZ (Clay St to 800' South of Meadowlark Rd) - Reconstruction	175,000		5,690,000			5,865,000
		2017-13							
	D/P	/ 2019-8	CTH ZZ (800' South of Meadowlark Rd to Tezlaiff Rd) - Reconstruction	460,000		4,459,000			4,919,000
	D/P/M/G	2020-6	CTH HH (Holmgren Way to Ashland Ave) - Reconstruction				2,067,500		2,067,500
	D	2018-5	CTH T (Pine Street to Highway Street) - 6 Culvert Replacement	40,607	250,000				290,607
	D	2018-7	CTH G (STH 96 to CTH V) - Surface Maintenance		1,900,000				1,900,000
	D	2018-8	CTH T (CTH N to RR) - Reconstruction		672,000				672,000
	D	2018-9	CTH T (CTH KB to Blahnik Rd) - Reconstruction		3,300,000				3,300,000
	D/P	2019-1	CTH EE (CTH U to CTH GE) - Surface Maintenance			350,000			350,000
	D	2019-2	CTH JJ (CTH V to Hazen Rd) - Surface Maintenance			310,000			310,000
	D	2019-3	CTH EB (CTH F to CTH EE) - Reconstruction			605,000			605,000
	D/M	2019-10	Southern Arterial (CTH F to Lawrence Dr) - Design, Survey, Engineering			3,000,000			3,000,000
	D	2020-1	CTH IV (CTH P to B/K Line Rd) - Surface Maintenance			250,000		1,000,000	1,250,000
	D	2020-2	CTH V (CTH T to CTH IV) - Reconstruction				250,000		250,000
	D/P	2020-3	CTH W (County Line to STH 96) - Reconstruction				4,000,000		4,000,000
	D	2020-4	CTH PP (STH 96 to CTH W) - Reconstruction				2,475,000		2,475,000
	D	2021-1	CTH J (CTH EB to CTH C) - Reconstruction					400,000	400,000
	D	2021-2	CTH GV (Hoffman Road to STH 172 Ranges) - Reconstruction					400,000	400,000
	D	2021-3	CTH T (STH 54 to Caledonia Dr) - Reconstruction					825,000	825,000
	D	2021-4	CTH DDD (CTH DO to French Rd) - Reconstruction					1,020,000	1,020,000
	D	2021-5	CTH XX (CTH O to RR Tracks) - Reconstruction					500,000	500,000
	D/P	2021-6	CTH PP (Man-Cali Rd to STH 96) - Reconstruction					2,900,000	2,900,000
	D	2021-7	CTH O (East River Dr to CTH XX) - Reconstruction					350,000	350,000
	D	2021-8	CTH OE (Ouragamie Rd to Gerits Rd) - Reconstruction					270,000	270,000
	D	2021-9	CTH GE (STH 172 to STH 54) - Reconstruction					375,000	375,000
Planning, Development, & Transportation Total				11,039,214	9,783,000	17,622,000	12,342,500	8,290,000	59,076,714
Less: Non-bond funding sources				(1,765,649)	(1,713,553)	(6,204,053)	(3,462,553)	(1,617,063)	(14,762,861)
Planning, Development, & Transportation Bond Request Total				\$ 9,273,565	\$ 8,069,447	\$ 11,417,947	\$ 8,879,947	\$ 6,672,937	\$ 44,313,853

Key for Funding Source:

D= Debt Service G=Grants and Aides O = Operating Revenues M = Municipal Funds P = Property Tax GF = General Fund Fund Balance TIF = TIF District S = Stadium District Sales Tax Refund

DIVISION/ DEPARTMENT	FUNDING SOURCE	DEPT PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2017	2019	2020	2021	TOTAL
				2018	2019	2020	2021	
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, & TRANSPORTATION:								
Airport								
	O/G	1	Reconstruct Taxiway D East of Taxiway G, Storm Sewer Rehab, & Taxiway D	3,409,308				3,409,308
	O/G	2	Construct East Service Road Phase 2	689,586				689,586
	O/G	3	Design, Environmental Assessment, & Construct E GA Apron Expansion	251,446	2,615,038			2,866,484
	O/G	4	Construct East Service Road Phase 3		738,683			738,683
	O/G	5	Design & Reconstruct Taxiway A/F, D3/D2, Air Carrier Ramp, Construct		259,584			259,584
	O/G	6	Categorical Exclusion, Design, & Construct Frontage Road		10,816			10,816
	O/G	7	Construct Public Parking Rehab, Replacement of Lighting & Perimeter Barrier			78,740		78,740
	O/G	8	Design & Construct Security Checkpoint Exit Lane Upgrades		111,175			111,175
	O/G	9	Design & Construct Curbside Canopy					
	O/G	10	Design & Construct Baggage Claim Carousel Replacement			584,929		584,929
	O/G	11	Design & Construct Westside Access Road			211,693	2,115,651	2,388,999
	O/G	12	Environmental Assessment & Design of Westside Perimeter Road			187,177		187,177
	O/G	13	Construct West Service Road Rehabilitation			203,428	1,683,361	1,907,037
						233,964		233,964
						182,498		182,498
							1,034,155	1,034,155
Port and Resource Recovery								
	O	1	Bay Port Expansion					
	O	2	Brown County South Landfill					
					1,888,481			1,888,481
					200,000	4,000,000		8,200,000
Public Works								
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Arena Chiller Replacement					250,000
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Arena Ice Making Equipment Replacement					325,000
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Hall of Fame Electrical Switchgear Replacement					315,000
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Resch Center Roof Replacement					1,307,000
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Shopko Hall Roof Replacement					500,000
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Shopko Hall HVAC Equipment Replacement					500,000
	S		Veteran's Memorial Complex - Shopko Hall Air Handling Units & Exhaust					250,000
	S		CTH B Veterans Ave to CTH J - Surface Maintenance	230,000				230,000
	G	2017-4	CTH B Veterans Ave to CTH J - Surface Maintenance	285,000				285,000
	G	2017-7	CTH UK (Wisconsin Ave to Irish Rd) - Maintenance	200,000				200,000
	G/M	2017-8	CTH UK (CTH UK & Wood Lane Intersection) - Traffic Signals	250,000				250,000
	G	2017-9	West Side CTH's Joint Filling - Asphalt Cracking Filling		889,000			925,224
	P/G	2019-5	CTH HS (Bridge Over Suamico River) - Bridge Replacement	36,224				824,597
	P/G	2019-6	CTH D (Bridge Over Plum Creek) - Bridge Replacement	32,597				909,558
	P/G	2020-7	CTH R (Bridge Over Devils River Trail) - Bridge Replacement	38,568				1,019,693
	P/G	2020-8	CTH R (Bridge Over S. Wall St) - Bridge Replacement	39,693				960,106
	P/G	2020-9	CTH V (Bridge Over Bower Creek) - Bridge Replacement	41,106				965,205
	P/G	2020-10	CTH J (Bridge Over Suamico River) - Bridge Replacement	41,205				924,000
	P/G	2018-3	CTH M (Bridge Over Suamico River) - Bridge Replacement		800,000			800,000
	P/G	2018-4	CTH MM (Bridge Over Bower Creek) - Bridge Replacement		778,000			778,000
	P	2018-6	CTH Z (Fairview Rd to CTH NN) - Box Culvert Replacement		204,500			204,500
	P	2020-5	CTH R (Devils River Trail to CTH KB) - Recondition					200,000
	P		Preliminary Costs Future Highway Projects	40,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,040,000
Planning, Development, & Transportation Non-Bond Request Total				5,581,733	5,767,796	12,203,772	9,367,131	45,240,734
Total Planning, Development, & Transportation Requests				\$ 14,855,298	\$ 13,837,243	\$ 21,083,719	\$ 16,040,078	\$ 69,554,587

- This project has already been approved. Staff is working to secure additional non-bond funding.

- Stadium District sales tax refund of \$4,349,954 has been set aside to fund projects approved for the Veterans Memorial Complex.

VILLAGE OF ALLOUEZ

Allouez Village Hall • 1900 Libal Street • Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301-2453
Phone No.: (920) 448-2800 • Fax No.: (920) 448-2850

Department of Public Works

Planning, Development, and Transportation Committee
Brown County

July 19, 2016

RE: Proposed County Ordinance 6.14
Village of Allouez Comments

Dear Sir;

The following comments are provided on behalf of the Village Board of the Village of Allouez regarding the development of an ordinance modifying the administration and cost-sharing of joint road projects between Brown County and the local municipal governments.

The Village of Allouez comments are as follows.

1. The development of a new road construction and cost allocation ordinance should be a joint effort of Brown County and the municipalities. It is important that all parties have input and both parties reach an acceptable agreement. We appreciate the opportunity to input at the July 25th meeting, but further discussion will be needed to reach a workable approach for all parties.
2. The legal interpretation of Wis. Stats. 83.05 needs to be discussed further. Allouez does not concur with the interpretation of this ordinance as presented by Brown County. Legal counsel for Brown County and the municipalities should be involved in development of the county ordinance. Allouez legal counsel is reviewing Wis. Stats. 83.05 but additional time is needed for this review.
3. Further clarification of the municipality "authority" is needed, and this is to the benefit of Brown County as well as the municipalities. The "authority" seems to include:
 - a. The municipality can retain an engineering firm for design of the project, so engineering may not be performed by the county as is the present case.
 - b. The municipality can supervise the construction, which means that a consultant can be retained by the municipality. This may be a cost-share task with the county that is presently not incurred on county projects.
 - c. The municipality can publicly bid the construction work for a project, which means that county work forces may not be used on these joint municipal/county projects. This is a significant change from current projects.

4. The development of the ordinance should include the cost allocations between the parties, and the process for negotiating the cost-share agreement. This process should be defined and assigned to appropriate the individual/committee. It is important that the process include reasonable and appropriate cost sharing, and a method to discuss and define acceptable terms.
5. One topic to address is allocation of stormwater collection and treatment costs. County projects include storm conveyance and treatment costs (ditches, culverts, swales for treatment) in rural areas. In a municipal project stormwater conveyance and treatment costs are also incurred and the county should share a reasonable cost. The interpretation of Wis. Stats. 83.05 is important in this issue. Past practice has been that the county shares in its share of the stormwater system costs.
6. Should county bridge projects also be addressed in this ordinance?

These are a few of the questions and concerns that should be addressed during the development of the Brown County ordinance. Please consider these items as this proceeds.

Sincerely,



James Rafter
Village President



Craig Berndt, P.E.
Director, Public Works



Municipal Services Center

County Executive Troy Streckenbach
County Board Supervisor Tom Lund
County Board Supervisors

Dear County Elected Officials,

The Village Board of the Village of Suamico has officially gone on record in opposition to the proposed Brown County Ordinance 6.14, County Trunk Highway Maintenance and Improvements.

The Village of Suamico believes that the current and long term practice of joint funding (50/50 financial split) of county trunk highway projects best reflects the cooperative financial responsibility of local municipalities and Brown County as roadway improvements are planned, designed and constructed to meet the needs of all Brown County residents. All county residents use these county trunk highways not just the residents of the local municipalities, hence all county residents and the overall Brown County tax base should contribute to these improvements.

We respectfully request that you take these thoughts and concerns into account when making any and all decisions on necessary county trunk highway projects in the future, including the adoption of any ordinances that better defines future expectations on the part of all parties, local municipalities and Brown County.

We, thank you, for the opportunity of commenting on this proposed ordinance.

Sincerely,

Steve Kubacki, Village Administrator

Laura Nelson, Village President

RESOLUTION 16-74
OPPOSING PROPOSED CHANGE IN BROWN COUNTY HIGHWAY
IMPROVEMENT COST SHARING POLICIES

WHEREAS, Fifty-six (56) County Trunk Highways ("CTH") traverse the 530 square miles (land only) of Brown County; and

WHEREAS, the Brown County Planning Commission Board of Directors and the Transportation Subcommittee, of which the Brown County Highway Department is a member, has created the Brown County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to promote the additional modes of transportation such as bicycles and pedestrians and CTH facilities provide a critical link throughout the region for these modes of transportation; and

WHEREAS, of the CTH in Brown County, portions of at least 31 of them are located within the two (2) cities, nine (9) villages and two (2) urban town centers, comprising the urbanized area of Brown County, (hereinafter "urbanized area"); and

WHEREAS, the CTH in the urbanized area not only serve all residents of the county, but are integral components of popular destination points, shopping hubs, local attractions and sites ("economic development areas") central to the economic growth and vitality of Brown County ; and

WHEREAS, 90% of the equalized area tax base of Brown County is located with the urbanized area and further, almost 92% of general property tax revenue paid to Brown County comes from the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, recognizing the crucial economic partnership between Brown County and its urbanized area, the Brown County Board has, over decades, established its policy of requiring a "Brown County Municipal Agreement" with standard general terms, including:

1. County lead on the project in collaboration with the municipal jurisdiction;
2. County performs and/or supervises work;
3. 50-50 cost share for eligible components of CTH improvement projects, including 50-50 cost share for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and including components of highway improvement projects vital to the traffic, storm water and other unique needs of economic development areas of the urbanized area;
4. Maintenance responsibility and any jurisdictional transfers; and

WHEREAS, the Brown County Public Works Department has proposed that the County abandon the Brown County Municipal Agreement in favor of relying on vague and outdated state statutes, which the Department believes allows the County to:

1. reimburse municipalities in the urbanized area for the cost of 22 feet of pavement;
2. reimburse municipalities for an as yet to be defined "... portion of the costs of grading, draining and appertaining structures"; and
3. unilaterally determine the scope of the County's facility maintenance obligations; and

WHEREAS, reliance on outdated statutory guidelines and a unilateral definition of maintenance for CTH improvement projects in urbanized area will unfairly shift additional improvement costs to the very residents of the County that are currently shouldering close to 75% of those improvement costs while at the same time providing CTH improvements at no cost to rural residents; and

WHEREAS, the cost share should be based on actual project costs that can be \$600 to \$700 per linear foot just for the pavement and base (County share of \$300 to \$350 per linear foot) for a reconstructed arterial CTH rather than an artificially set amount of County contribution of \$68 per linear foot that is not based on the actual field conditions nor required pavement structure to accommodate regional traffic; and

WHEREAS, the proposal to abandon the Brown County Municipal Agreement will not result in a net tax savings; rather the amount saved by residents in rural Brown County will be shifted to the urbanized Brown County residents; and

WHEREAS, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and the associated maintenance, is a critical component of the overall transportation system as promoted through the Brown County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan; and

WHEREAS, continuing the County policy of requiring the Brown County Municipal Agreement allows the County and the municipality to collectively define their respective maintenance responsibilities over the completed improvements; and

WHEREAS, Brown County receives state aide for the maintenance of county highways, including drainage facilities associated with CTH; and

WHEREAS, the County Planning, Development and Transportation Committee has asked solicited municipal feedback on the proposed abandonment of the Brown County Municipal Agreement at its meeting scheduled for July 25, 2016.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DE PERE THAT:

The City of De Pere is opposed to Brown County abandoning the Brown County Municipal Agreement for CTH improvements that was in place up through 2011, rather than the modifications that were made after 2011 without any input from municipalities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

The City of De Pere encourages continued intergovernmental cooperation among the County and its urbanized area in order to continue and promote the current and future economic development of the County.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of De Pere, Wisconsin, this 19th day of July, 2016.

APPROVED:


Michael J. Walsh, Mayor

ATTEST:


Shana D. Ledvina, Clerk-Treasurer

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0



July 21, 2016

Mr. Bernie Erickson, Chair
Brown County Planning, Development & Transportation Committee
UW-Ag & Extension Center
1150 Bellevue Street, Room 161
Green Bay, WI 54302

RE: Proposed County Ordinance 6.14 Relating to County Trunk Highway Maintenance and Improvements

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Ledgeview Town Board. At their meeting on July 19, 2016, they received and discussed the communication from the Brown County Public Works Director that included a memo and related policy decision regarding future highway maintenance and improvements in the County. As written, the Ledgeview Town Board opposes proposed County Ordinance 6.14.

Recognizing the crucial economic partnership between Brown County and its urbanized area, the Brown County Board has, over decades, established its policy of requiring a "Brown County Municipal Agreement" with standard general terms, including:

1. County lead on the project in collaboration with the municipal jurisdiction.
2. County performs and/or supervises work.
3. 50-50 cost share for eligible components of CTH improvement projects, including 50-50 cost share for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and including components of highway improvement projects vital to the traffic, storm water and other unique needs of economic development areas of the urbanized area.
4. Maintenance responsibility and any jurisdictional transfers.

The Brown County Public Works Department has proposed that the County abandon the Brown County Municipal Agreement in favor of relying on vague and outdated state statutes, which the Department believes allows the County to:

1. Reimburse municipalities in the urbanized area for the cost of 22 feet of pavement.
2. Reimburse municipalities for an as yet to be defined "... portion the costs of grading, draining and appertaining structures".
3. Unilaterally determine the scope of the County's facility maintenance obligations.

The Town of Ledgeview is opposed to Brown County abandoning the Brown County Municipal Agreement for CTH improvements that was in place up through 2011, rather than the modifications that were made after 2011 without any input from municipalities.

The Town of Ledgeview opposes the proposed County Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. Reliance on outdated statutory guidelines and a unilateral definition of maintenance for CTH improvement projects in urbanized area will unfairly shift additional improvement costs to the very residents of the County that are currently shouldering most of those improvement costs while at the same time providing CTH improvements at no cost to rural residents.
2. The proposal to abandon the Brown County Municipal Agreement will not result in a net tax savings; rather the amount saved by residents in rural Brown County will be shifted to the urbanized Brown County residents.
3. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and the associated maintenance, is a critical component of the overall transportation system as promoted through the Brown County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
4. Continuing the County policy of requiring the Brown County Municipal Agreement allows the County and the municipality to collectively define their respective maintenance responsibilities over the completed improvements.
5. Brown County receives state aide for the maintenance of county highways, including drainage facilities associated with CTH's.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our input on this very important matter. We look forward to working with the County on continued intergovernmental cooperation in order to further promote the current and future economic development of Brown County.

Sincerely,



Sarah K. Burdette, Clerk/Administrator
Town of Ledgeview

cc: Ledgeview Town Board
Troy Streckenbach, County Executive
John Van Dyck, Supervisor District 17
Dave Kaster, Supervisor District 16

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Brown County

2198 GLENDALE AVENUE
GREEN BAY, WI 54303

PHONE (920) 492-4925 FAX (920) 434-4576
EMAIL: bc_highway@co.brown.wi.us

PAUL A. FONTECCHIO, P.E.
DIRECTOR

TO: PD&T Committee
FROM: Paul Fontecchio, P.E.
DATE: June 27, 2016
RE: Overtime Scenarios

At the request of the PD&T Committee during the May 23, 2016 meeting, I am reporting on the estimated additional costs for overtime for the following three scenarios using 2015 data:

1. Additional cost if vacation, holidays, etc. counted towards the 40 hours of work.
 - This change would result in \$26,934.47 in additional cost (pay & fringe).
 - It would also generate \$28,849.73 in additional revenue:
 - \$9,702.13 would be charged to the State of Wisconsin.
 - \$7,034.37 would be charged to County 240 fund.
 - \$9,645.97 would be charged to capital projects (bond/levy).
 - \$2,467.26 would be charged to other sources (municipal, inter-department, private, etc.)
2. Additional cost for the entire year if hours worked outside of regularly scheduled hours of work were treated as overtime.
 - This change would result in \$43,587.89 in additional cost (pay & fringe).
 - It would also generate \$43,927.23 in additional revenue:
 - \$14,624.62 would be charged to the State of Wisconsin.
 - \$11,066.79 would be charged to County 240 fund.
 - \$14,472.93 would be charged to capital projects (bond/levy).
 - \$3,762.90 would be charged to other sources (municipal, inter-department, private, etc.)
3. Additional cost for winter/plowing months (2nd Monday November to 2nd Monday April) if hours worked outside of regularly scheduled hours of work were treated as overtime.
 - This change would result in \$29,029.19 in additional cost (pay & fringe).
 - It would also generate \$29,364.44 in additional revenue:
 - \$10,323.25 would be charged to the State of Wisconsin.
 - \$7,315.72 would be charged to County 240 fund.
 - \$9,212.02 would be charged to capital projects (bond/levy).
 - \$2,513.44 would be charged to other sources (municipal, inter-department, private, etc.)

Brown County Departments with "Stand By Pay" or "Call in Pay"									
Department	Stand By	Call in	Other	Guaranteed 2 hours	KRONOS Entry	2015 Actual Fiscal	2015 Fiscal if paid at 1.5	2016 Actual Fiscal	2016 Fiscal if paid at 1.5
Technology Services			Exempt Staff cover the emergency line during non-business hours and receive no additional compensation	No	None				
Medical Examiner			Staff are considered on-call and receive set compensation on a per call basis	No					
Health		Sanitarians have a call list used during non-business hours and are only compensated if they receive a call, then paid hourly		Yes	Keyed as regular pay; Only OT if over 40 hours worked for week	No Records Kept	No Records Kept	No Records Kept	No Records Kept
Airport		Staff may get called in for emergencies and receive their hourly compensation for time worked		Yes	Keyed as regular pay; Only OT if over 40 hours worked for week	\$807.84	\$1,211.76	\$458.52	\$687.78
Public Works		Prior to June 2016, staff were called in for emergencies and paid 1.5 times their regular rate of pay; For snow plowing, staff received their hourly rate of pay for time worked			Keyed as emergency pay and received 1.5 times their regular rate of pay, for a min of 2 hrs; Snow plowing is paid at regular rate of pay unless already over 40 hours worked for week	\$6,457.24	Already paid at OT	\$3,367.07	Already paid at OT
Public Safety		Staff may get called in early or asked to stay late to cover gaps in scheduling; this time is paid at their hourly rate	Staff are scheduled for 'cover weeks' but only get compensated (reg. hourly rate) if they get called in to cover the shift	No	Keyed as regular pay; Only OT if over 40 hours worked for week	\$13,072.80	\$19,669.20	\$5,242.58	\$7,871.97
Sheriff		Correctional Staff (non-bargaining) may have to come in early or stay late to cover scheduling gaps; this is paid at their hourly rate. Employee handbook 11.01(c) does not allow for call-in pay when additional hours are contiguous with regularly scheduled shift.							
ETC		APNP Staff do have call in pay but are only compensated at set rate of \$25 per day if called in and paid set rate per physical they complete.		No					
Human Services	Juvenile Intake and Child Protection both have stand by pay for employees covering those shifts. They also receive a set \$ amt as follows: \$22.07 Mon, Tues, Wed, Thur (4:30p to 8:30a); \$126.10 Fri (4:30p) through Mon (8:30a); and \$63.05 Holidays	Staff also receive their hourly rate for all time worked when called while covering stand by shift		No *	Keyed as regular pay; Only OT if over 40 hours worked for week	\$13,830.83	\$20,746.24	\$6,921.47	\$10,382.20

* financial impact may be slightly higher due to No 2 hour guarantee